

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/080,701	02/25/2002	Kazunori Anazawa	112055	8363
25944	7590 08/25/2004		EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			MAYEKAR, KISHOR	
P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		1753	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/080,701	ANAZAWA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kishor Mayekar	1753				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a REANDONE.	mely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication.				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 M	lay 2004.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-14 is/are withdrawr 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 15-29 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	n from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the one of the correction and the correction including the correction inc						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ty documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/02, 12/03 & 4/04. S. Patent and Trademark Office.	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dai 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1-14, drawn to an apparatus for producing a carbon structure, classified in class 422, subclass 186.04.
 - II. Claims 15-29, drawn to a method for producing carbon structure, classified in class 204, subclass 173.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions of Groups II and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice isotope separations.
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the

Art Unit: 1753

search required for Group II is not required for Group I, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

- 4. During a telephone conversation between Examiner Steven VerSteeg and Attorney Joel Armstrong on 26 May 2004 and the confirmation filed 26 May 2004 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group II, claims 15-29. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 1-14 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.
- 5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Page 4

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and § 103

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 15, 17, 24, 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by JP-08-048510, a reference with a translation cited by Applicant. See abstract; Figs 1, 5 and 6; and paragraph [0002] and [0003].

Application/Control Number: 10/080,701

Art Unit: 1753

9. Claims 15-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over YOMICHI et al. ("Effects of high magnetic field on the Morphology of carbon nanotubes and selective synthesis of fullerenes", Applied Physics letters, Vol. 74, No. 13, 29 March 1999, pp. 1827-1829) in view of JP '510, YOKOMICHI, another reference cited by Applicant, discloses in a method of producing a carbon structure all the steps as claimed except for the detailing of the orientation of the electrodes (abstract and columns in page 1827). JP '510 as applied above in a method of producing a carbon structure the detailing of the electrodes having forefront portions opposed to each other (Figs. 1 or 5). The subject matter as whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified YOKOMICHI's teachings as shown by JP '510 because this a configuration of the electrodes in the arc discharge.

As to the subject matter of each of claims 18-20, the selection of any of known equivalent arrangement magnets would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

As to the subject matter of each of claims 21-23, 26 and 27, the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the reference's teachings

Art Unit: 1753

because it has been settled that proper adjustment of a known effective variable of a known or obvious process is within the capabilities of one having ordinary skill in the art. *In re Aller* 105 USPQ 233; *In re Boesch* 205 USPQ 215.

As to the subject matter of claim 25, JP '510 shows the limitation (Fig. 5 or 11). The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the reference's teachings as shown by JP '510 because the selection of any of known equivalent electrode configurations (cathode not larger than anode) would have bee within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kishor Mayekar whose telephone number is (571) 272-1339. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/080,701

Art Unit: 1753

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kishor Mayekar Primary Examiner Art Unit 1753